

In this Issue :

Education: Free, Compulsory, Universal - p. 2

The Sherman Adams Case - p. 3

Letters to the Editors - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 27

July 5th, 1958

Threepence

Mock-Indignation and the HUNGARIAN EXECUTIONS

WITH the honourable exception of individuals whose spirit has not been blunted by the violence, the brutality, the callousness and the widespread misery in the midst of potential plenty which characterise our age, the "wave of horror" provoked by the announcement of the execution of Imre Nagy and his friends has a false ring about it. Indeed, those who are most genuinely shocked are, we would say, simple, politically "uneducated" people who are horrified by violence in all its manifestations, irrespective of whether it is carried out with the due sanction of law or in some dark dungeon operated by the secret police; people whose feelings cannot be regulated to "hot or cold" by considerations of political expediency, nationalism or even self-interest.

But these are the inarticulate reactions so far as mass communications are concerned. "Public indignation" to-day is expressed by Press and the political parties which, even before they have had time to wipe away their crocodile tears of sympathy for the victims, were busily exploiting the murders to their political advantage as well as cold-bloodedly speculating on the politi-

only do not fit into a neat pattern, with the "West" on one side of the line and the "East" on the other, but are continuously being modified. Politics is a hand-to-mouth business; propaganda, unlike advertising which aims at conditioning the mind, is directed to giving it the kind of flexibility which will make it possible for the public to accept white one day and black, with equal facility, the next. The public, as we have said so often before, is viewed by the leaders only as the instrument in the power struggle. This does not shock us; what does, and makes us into anarchist propagandists, is that the brainwashing is so thorough that the majority of the people do not consider themselves capable of being anything but instruments who need the directing hand of politicians and leaders! So much so that when some of the "instruments" refuse to acquiesce, or express their discontent by disobedience, the majority joins the politicians and the ruling-élite-minded press in denouncing them as "bandits", "traitors", "rebels", "terrorists". They even accuse strikers of "holding the nation to ransom", and those who refuse to kill their fellow men, are singled out as "cow-

(Let us make our position quite clear. Whilst welcoming the mutual destruction of the power maniacs, there is all the evidence we want, to show that the possibly dangerous nature of their "occupation" no more dissuades others from stepping into their shoes than the death penalty dissuades crazed people from committing murders. Palace revolutions leave untouched the relationship between the rulers and the ruled. However, from the point of view of the latter a period of upheaval in the ruling hierarchy may well be a propitious moment to strike out, since not only are the leaders divided but it is reasonable to suppose that the coercive machine through which they implement their power is equally divided, and therefore weakened. But . . .)

★

BUT . . . a public which canonises a Nagy, why should it not have an equally short memory the day when Khrushchev himself is the victim of a new power-ridden clique? After all, at that exalted level it is *might not right* which succeeds. And

the liquidation of Mr. K. would only mean that someone else has more power than him; and therefore by contrast Mr. K. is really a more democratic member of the hierarchy!

Let us refresh our memories. Mr. Paul Ignotus in his profile of Mr. Nagy in the *Manchester Guardian* (June 18) presents us with a picture of this "Hungarian farmer's son" absorbed with agricultural problems and politically a "moderate in everything excepting moderation", though there "is no doubt about his having been a sincere Communist". (Wasn't Lenin a sincere Communist, Mr. Ignotus? Or is it that "sincere communist" is not a swear word if applied to the Kremlin men when, much against their will, they are eliminated by their power rivals?). Imre Nagy spent several years in Russia, "returning to his country in 1945 in the wake of the victorious Soviet Army". And he was given a job in the government right away. To ask us to believe that with such a background (and let us not forget that this was the Stalin era, the "thaw" setting in only

Continued on p. 2

"The wise man can suffice himself . . . civil society is an external association for purpose of protection."

—EPICUR

The Day We G on the Telly

IT seems that one of the comrades got his name in the papers for anarchist views, and that led to an article in another paper, this was in fact picked up by the B.B.C.'s Television producer of 'To-night' who wanted to 'do' a programme on (a) The I.A.C. The L.A.G., (c) The Malatesta Club 'Anarchism', he wasn't quite sure w

We had what might be termed 'story conference', if there had been a story; or a 'briefing' had anybody been briefed. The famed Malatesta Band (trad.) was out from the star cause nobody could be heard to talk while it was performing and also was all to go on film the cutting music was rather difficult.

We got off to a rather frosty start, an egghead wanted to know what 'To-night' was. It was explained to him that the other comrades who hadn't the courage to ask, that it was a magic programme of items lasting six to ten minutes each, which was screened a four or five times a week in the evening. The production schedule was rather flexible, to allow of topics and whilst some of the items were from the Malatesta Club item was to be filmed. Its viewing figures were estimated by the producer at five million. Most of us were unimpressed as most of us were non-viewers.

When the history of anarchism on television comes to be written it will be a happy one. Whether there will be television in a free society is a mooter than most. The comrades

In this Issue :

Education: Free, Compulsory, Universal - p. 2

The Sherman Adams Case - p. 3

Letters to the Editors - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 27

July 5th, 1958

Mock-Indignation and the HUNGARIAN EXECUTION

WITH the honourable exception of individuals whose spirit has not been blunted by the violence, the brutality, the callousness and the widespread misery in the midst of potential plenty which characterise our age, the "wave of horror" provoked by the announcement of the execution of Imre Nagy and his friends has a false ring about it. Indeed, those who are most genuinely shocked are, we would say, simple, politically "uneducated" people who are horrified by violence in all its manifestations, irrespective of whether it is carried out with the due sanction of law or in some dark dungeon operated by the secret police; people whose feelings cannot be regulated to "hot or cold" by considerations of political expediency, nationalism or even self-interest.

But these are the inarticulate reactions so far as mass communications are concerned. "Public indignation" to-day is expressed by Press and the political parties which, even before they have had time to wipe away their crocodile tears of sympathy for the victims, were busily exploiting the murders to their political advantage as well as cold-bloodedly speculating on the political motives behind the executions. And even the speculations are not objective but coloured by the political interests of those concerned.

To say that Khrushchev has blundered politically is to assume that in the game of politics the leaders either rarely make mistakes or that a particular action has misfired when the political results are not all to their advantage. The political interests of the different powers not

only do not fit into a neat pattern, with the "West" on one side of the line and the "East" on the other, but are continuously being modified. Politics is a hand-to-mouth business; propaganda, unlike advertising which aims at conditioning the mind, is directed to giving it the kind of flexibility which will make it possible for the public to accept white one day and black, with equal facility, the next. The public, as we have said so often before, is viewed by the leaders only as the instrument in the power struggle. This does not shock us; what does, and makes us into anarchist propagandists, is that the brainwashing is so thorough that the majority of the people do not consider themselves *capable* of being anything but instruments who need the directing hand of politicians and leaders! So much so that when some of the "instruments" refuse to acquiesce, or express their discontent by disobedience, the majority joins the politicians and the ruling-élite-minded press in denouncing them as "bandits", "traitors", "rebels", "terrorists". They even accuse strikers of "holding the nation to ransom", and those who refuse to kill their fellow men, are singled out as "cowards", "fascists" or "communists" (depending on who the enemy happens to be). Yet when the leaders fall out among themselves, instead of welcoming the palpable evidence that the quest for personal power is still a dangerous occupation containing within itself the seeds of destruction for those who aspire to it, the public, hypnotised by the sloppy sentimentality of an interested press, goes into deep mourning for the victims!

(Let us make our position quite clear. Whilst welcoming the mutual destruction of the power maniacs, there is all the evidence we want, to show that the possibly dangerous nature of their "occupation" no more dissuades others from stepping into their shoes than the death penalty dissuades crazed people from committing murders. Palace revolutions leave untouched the relationship between the rulers and the ruled. However, from the point of view of the latter a period of upheaval in the ruling hierarchy may well be a propitious moment to strike out, since not only are the leaders divided but it is reasonable to suppose that the coercive machine through which they implement their power is equally divided, and therefore weakened. But . . .).

★

BUT . . . a public which canonises a Nagy, why should it not have an equally short memory the day when Khrushchev himself is the victim of a new power-ridden clique? After all, at that exalted level it is *might not right* which succeeds. And

the liquidation of M mean that someone power than him; contrast Mr. K. democratic membership!

Let us refresh our memory. Paul Ignatus in his book *Imre Nagy in the Man* (June 18) presents a picture of this "Hungarian" absorbed with agricultural and politically everything except the fact that though there "is no having been a single (Wasn't Lenin a socialist, Mr. Ignatus? mere communist" word if applied to when, much again are eliminated rivals?). Imre Nagy, years in Russia, country in 1945 in victorious Soviet was given a job in right away. To that with such a let us not forget Stalin era, the "tha

The Archbishop on H-Bombs & M Render Unto (the British)

THE dictum of 'Render unto Caesar . . . ' has proved of tremendous value to the heads of established Churches through the ages when they have been faced with a choice between the tenets of Christianity and the ambitions of the secular powers that they serve.

During the years of the Inquisition the Catholic Church rendered unto Caesar the bodies of those who it had proved—being itself prosecutor, judge and jury—to be heretics, and to this day faithful

The alliance of preaches meekness givenness of enemies other cheek and revalues in favour with the institution power is clearly a which one or the Perhaps it can be cline of the Roman cated the victory ethic over the n Caesars, but certainly himself did not ce

DEMONSTRATIONS IN S. AFRICA

SINCE it was returned to power a coloured' to the Africans which has

whether it is carried out in the due sanction of law or in some dark dungeon operated by the secret police; people whose feelings cannot be regulated to "hot or cold" by considerations of political expediency, nationalism or even self-interest.

But these are the inarticulate reactions so far as mass communications are concerned. "Public indignation" to-day is expressed by Press and the political parties which, even before they have had time to wipe away their crocodile tears of sympathy for the victims, were busily exploiting the murders to their political advantage as well as cold-bloodedly speculating on the political motives behind the executions. And even the speculations are not objective but coloured by the political interests of those concerned.

To say that Khrushchev has blundered politically is to assume that in the game of politics the leaders either rarely make mistakes or that a particular action has misfired when the political results are not all to their advantage. The political interests of the different powers not

and makes us into anarchist propagandists, is that the brainwashing is so thorough that the majority of the people do not consider themselves *capable* of being anything but instruments who need the directing hand of politicians and leaders! So much so that when some of the "instruments" refuse to acquiesce, or express their discontent by disobedience, the majority joins the politicians and the ruling-élite-minded press in denouncing them as "bandits", "traitors", "rebels", "terrorists". They even accuse strikers of "holding the nation to ransom", and those who refuse to kill their fellow men, are singled out as "cowards", "fascists" or "communists" (depending on who the enemy happens to be). Yet when the *leaders* fall out among themselves, instead of welcoming the palpable evidence that the quest for personal power is still a dangerous occupation containing within itself the seeds of destruction for those who aspire to it, the public, hypnotised by the sloppy sentimentality of an interested press, goes into deep mourning for the victims!

strike out, since not only are the leaders divided but it is reasonable to suppose that the coercive machine through which they implement their power is equally divided, and therefore weakened. But . . .).

★

BUT . . . a public which canonises a Nagy, why should it not have an equally short memory the day when Khrushchev himself is the victim of a new power-ridden clique? After all, at that exalted level it is *might not right* which succeeds. And

(Wasn't Lenin a
ist, Mr. Ignotus?
cere communist"
word if applied to
when, much again
are eliminated
rivals?). Imre N
years in Russia,
country in 1945 in
victorious Soviet
was given a job i
right away. To
that with such a
let us not forget
Stalin era, the "th

DEMONSTRATIONS IN S. AFRICA

SINCE it was returned to power a few months ago, the South African Nationalist Government has been forging ahead with plans to keep South Africa white, at least that part of it which holds political and economic power.

Last week thousands of South African Indians were demonstrating against Government proclamations which will eventually deprive them of homes and livelihood. These proclamations, issued under the Groups Area Act, are aimed at the "racial re-zoning" of South Africa and will affect 50,000 Indians and 100,000 Africans. It is reported that almost the entire municipal area of Pretoria has been proclaimed a "white area", and non-whites have been given one to three years to get out. No plans have been made about where they have to go, and existing areas are already overcrowded. One report from South Africa says:

"All over South Africa Indian communities are to be uprooted. In scores of smaller towns entire Indian settlements are to be evicted and dumped on the veldt. Trading in towns is prohibited, and the settlements face economic ruin. Indian property-owners declare they will be dispossessed of property and land worth more than £15 million."

One of the tragedies of South Africa has been the lack of unity between the 'coloured' and African groups, much of it springing from the superior attitude of many 'col-

oured' to the Africans which has only strengthened Strydom's position. The recent Government proclamations, however, may encourage some kind of alliance between Indians and African groups which, if it happens, will unhappily be for the wrong reasons. But alliance or not it is obvious that property-owning and wealthy Indians are not going to give up their possessions without a struggle. It is therefore likely that they will support any resistance movement which springs up as a result of the Government's plans.

Meanwhile we wait in vain to hear the indignant protests from the Western world which only last week expressed its horrified disapproval when the hanging of Nagy was disclosed. The rules of politics are such that when the 'enemy' disposes of people it does not like, this is called murderous brutality. But, when an ally, or potential ally, gets rid of 'undesirables' this is either ignored, or excused on the grounds of law and order, or dismissed as 'internal matters' which only concern the Government involved.

No doubt the British Government will be ready with excuses why it is unwise and unnecessary to protest against the expropriation of property and removal of thousands of people to unspecified areas, so that the white man will not be disturbed by the close proximity of that strange animal with the brown face.

The Archbishop on H-Bombs & M Render Unto (the British

THE dictum of 'Render unto Caesar . . . ' has proved of tremendous value to the heads of established Churches through the ages when they have been faced with a choice between the tenets of Christianity and the ambitions of the secular powers that they serve.

During the years of the Inquisition the Catholic Church rendered unto Caesar the bodies of those who it had proved—being itself prosecutor, judge and jury—to be heretics, and to this day faithful Catholics maintain that it was not the Church which tortured and burnt, but the State. In 1929 the Pope signed the Lateran Pact with Mussolini, rendering unto the fascist Caesar the bodies of the Italian people in return for uninterrupted domination of their spirits.

And the very beginning of the established Protestant Church in England stemmed from the willingness of a number of churchmen to jettison established doctrine in return for establishment.

All for Survival

In each case the issue has been the survival of the Church as an institution whilst the maintenance of an unsullied religion has taken second place. Thus have the words of Jesus been "used to corrupt his own teachings whilst, ironically enough, the very existence of the Church during the first two centuries was due to the martyrdom of those Christians who refused to render unto Caesar all that he claimed and were thrown to the lions.

Again ironically, it was clearly the conversion of Caesar (Constantine) to the idea of making Christianity the official religion of the Roman Empire (even though it meant shifting the seat of empire to Byzantium from Rome, where paganism still held sway) which ensured the continued survival of the Christian Church but the corruption of Christ's teachings.

The alliance of
preaches meaknes
givenness of ener
other cheek and re
values in favour
with the institu
power is clearly
which one or the
Perhaps it can be
cline of the Rom
cated the victory
ethic over the
Caesars, but cert
himself did not ce
sword and there i
gest that his 'co
a matter of politi
that he had fores
future for Christ
to hitch his charic
at the same time
with an ethical b
in fact a power str
of the Senate of h

The Needs of th

And to this
breakaway union
to the establishm
Church in Rome
Orthodox Church
which was first
but is now Ista
Crusades, finance
other businessme
commercial emp
Inquisition and
the new breakawa
ism, to the allian
torships of this
unique interpreta
as preached by
Church in South
lished institution
have allied them
with the needs o
they serve and w

This being so,
mands from 'peo
Britain for a lea
on such troubles
H-Bomb are as
for honest sociali

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

July 5th, 1958

Threepence

"The wise man can suffice for himself . . . civil society is only an external association for the purpose of protection."

—EPICURUS.

Indignation and the AN EXECUTIONS

a neat pattern, one side of the "on the other, being modified. mouth business; ke advertising conditioning the to giving it the which will make public to accept black, with equal The public, as often before, is ers only as the power struggle. us; what does, anarchist propa- brainwashing is e majority of the sider themselves thing but instru- directing hand aders! So much of the "instru- quiesce, or ex- ent by disobedi- joins the politicking-élite-minded them as "ban- rebels", "terror- cuse strikers of n to ransom", ise to kill their ed out as "cow- "communists"

(Let us make our position quite clear. Whilst welcoming the mutual destruction of the power maniacs, there is all the evidence we want, to show that the possibly dangerous nature of their "occupation" no more dissuades others from stepping into their shoes than the death penalty dissuades crazed people from committing murders. Palace revolutions leave untouched the relationship between the rulers and the ruled. However, from the point of view of the latter a period of upheaval in the ruling hierarchy may well be a propitious moment to strike out, since not only are the leaders divided but it is reasonable to suppose that the coercive machine through which they implement their power is equally divided, and therefore weakened. But . . .).

★

BUT . . . a public which canonises a Nagy, why should it not have an equally short memory the day when Khrushchev himself is the victim of a new power-ridden clique? After all, at that exalted level it is *might not right* which succeeds. And

the liquidation of Mr. K. would only mean that someone else has more power than him; and therefore by contrast Mr. K. is really a more democratic member of the hierarchy!

Let us refresh our memories. Mr. Paul Ignotus in his profile of Mr. Nagy in the *Manchester Guardian* (June 18) presents us with a picture of this "Hungarian farmer's son" absorbed with agricultural problems and politically a "moderate in everything excepting moderation", though there "is no doubt about his having been a sincere Communist". (Wasn't Lenin a sincere Communist, Mr. Ignotus? Or is it that "sincere communist" is not a swear word if applied to the Kremlin men when, much against their will, they are eliminated by their power rivals?). Imre Nagy spent several years in Russia, "returning to his country in 1945 in the wake of the victorious Soviet Army". And he was given a job in the government right away. To ask us to believe that with such a background (and let us not forget that this was the Stalin era, the "thaw" setting in only

Continued on p. 3

The Archbishop on H-Bombs & Makarios Render Unto (the British) Caesar

THE dictum of 'Render unto Caesar . . .' has proved of tremendous value to the heads of established Churches through the ages when they have been faced with a choice between the tenets of Christianity and the ambitions of the secular powers that they serve.

During the years of the Inquisition the Catholic Church rendered unto Caesar the bodies of those who it had proved—being itself prosecutor, judge and jury—to be heretics, and to this day faithful Catholics maintain that it was not

The alliance of a religion which preaches meakness and love, forgiveness of enemies, turning the other cheek and rejection of material values in favour of the spiritual, with the institutions of secular power is clearly a contradiction in which one or the other must suffer. Perhaps it can be said that the decline of the Roman Empire indicated the victory of the Christian ethic over the militarism of the Caesars, but certainly Constantine himself did not cease to rule by the sword and there is evidence to sug-

The Day We Got on the Telly

IT seems that one of the comrades had got his name in the papers for his anarchist views, and that led to another article in another paper, this was in turn picked up by the B.B.C.'s Television producer of 'To-night' who wanted to 'do' a programme on (a) The I.A.C., (b) The L.A.G., (c) The Malatesta Club, (d) 'Anarchism', he wasn't quite sure which.

We had what might be termed a 'story conference', if there had been a story; or a 'briefing' had anybody been briefed. The famed Malatesta Jazz Band (trad.) was out from the start because nobody could be heard talking while it was performing and also as it was all to go on film the cutting with music was rather difficult.

We got off to a rather frosty start when an egghead wanted to know what 'To-night' was. It was explained to him and the other comrades who hadn't the courage to ask, that it was a magazine programme of items lasting six to nine minutes each, which was screened about four or five times a week in the early evening. The production schedule was rather flexible, to allow of topicality, and whilst some of the items were 'live' the Malatesta Club item was to be filmed. Its viewing figures were estimated by the producer at five million. Most of us were unimpressed as most of us were non-viewers.

When the history of anarchism on television comes to be written it will not be a happy one. Whether there will be television in a free society is a point mooted than most. The comrades who have appeared on this 'idiot's lantern' claimed to have had an unfair deal from the proprietors of the peepshow. However these were the Other People so whilst we got sympathy from this lot we had no guarantee that similar misunderstandings would not arise. The whole power lay in the shears of the film-cutters who would prepare our pearl of wisdom for the casting. For his part the producer would work with an interviewer who would ask questions to which we could give pithy answers. It was pointed out that one of the maxims learnt at mother's knee was 'ask silly questions and you'll get silly answers', however it was thought that a rehearsal before the filming would elicit questions and answers that were suitable.

From the start it was insisted that the ideas had to be simple in 'terms that the man and woman in the street would understand'. It was generally implied that the average I.Q. of T.V. viewers was

AFRICA

icans which has

what does, anarchist propaganda is the majority of the side themselves thing but instructing hand leaders! So much of the "instructing acquiesce, or extent by disobedience joins the politicking-élite-minded them as "ban-rebels", "terror-accuse strikers of in to ransom", use to kill their led out as "cow-communists" the enemy happens when the leaders themselves, instead palpable evidence personal power is occupation conf the seeds of e who aspire to notised by the y of an interest- deep mourning

AFRICA

icans which has Strydom's posi- Government pro- may encourage alliance between n groups which, unhappily be for But alliance or at property-own- Indians are not their possessions It is therefore will support any t which springs ne Government's

it in vain to hear tests from the he only last week fied disapproval f Nagy was dis- of politics are 'enemy' disposes not like, this is brutality. But, potential ally, gets s' this is either on the grounds or dismissed as which only con- t involved.

ish Government excuses why it is ssary to protest ation of property asands of people as, so that the be disturbed by of that strange own face.

well be a propitious moment to strike out, since not only are the leaders divided but it is reasonable to suppose that the coercive machine through which they implement their power is equally divided, and therefore weakened. But . . .).

★

BUT . . . a public which canonises a Nagy, why should it not have an equally short memory the day when Khrushchev himself is the victim of a new power-ridden clique? After all, at that exalted level it is *might not right* which succeeds. And

having been a sincere Communist". (Wasn't Lenin a sincere Communist, Mr. Ignotus? Or is it that "sincere communist" is not a swear word if applied to the Kremlin men when, much against their will, they are eliminated by their power rivals?). Imre Nagy spent several years in Russia, "returning to his country in 1945 in the wake of the victorious Soviet Army". And he was given a job in the government right away. To ask us to believe that with such a background (and let us not forget that this was the Stalin era, the "thaw" setting in only

☛ Continued on p. 3

The Archbishop on H-Bombs & Makarios Render Unto (the British) Caesar

THE dictum of 'Render unto Caesar . . . ' has proved of tremendous value to the heads of established Churches through the ages when they have been faced with a choice between the tenets of Christianity and the ambitions of the secular powers that they serve.

During the years of the Inquisition the Catholic Church rendered unto Caesar the bodies of those who it had proved—being itself prosecutor, judge and jury—to be heretics, and to this day faithful Catholics maintain that it was not the Church which tortured and burnt, but the State. In 1929 the Pope signed the Lateran Pact with Mussolini, rendering unto the fascist Caesar the bodies of the Italian people in return for uninterrupted domination of their spirits.

And the very beginning of the established Protestant Church in England stemmed from the willingness of a number of churchmen to jettison established doctrine in return for establishment.

All for Survival

In each case the issue has been the survival of the Church as an institution whilst the maintenance of an unsullied religion has taken second place. Thus have the words of Jesus been "used to corrupt his own teachings whilst, ironically enough, the very existence of the Church during the first two centuries was due to the martyrdom of those Christians who refused to render unto Caesar all that he claimed and were thrown to the lions.

Again ironically, it was clearly the conversion of Caesar (Constantine) to the idea of making Christianity the official religion of the Roman Empire (even though it meant shifting the seat of empire to Byzantium from Rome, where paganism still held sway) which ensured the continued survival of the Christian Church but the corruption of Christ's teachings.

The alliance of a religion which preaches meekness and love, forgiveness of enemies, turning the other cheek and rejection of material values in favour of the spiritual, with the institutions of secular power is clearly a contradiction in which one or the other must suffer. Perhaps it can be said that the decline of the Roman Empire indicated the victory of the Christian ethic over the militarism of the Caesars, but certainly Constantine himself did not cease to rule by the sword and there is evidence to suggest that his 'conversion' was more a matter of political expediency in that he had foresight to see a great future for Christianity and sought to hitch his chariot to its star, whilst at the same time it provided him with an ethical basis for what was in fact a power struggle with the rest of the Senate of his day.

The Needs of the State

And to this day, through the breakaway union tactics which led to the establishment of the Catholic Church in Rome (whilst leaving the Orthodox Church in Constantinople, which was first called Byzantium but is now Istanbul) through the Crusades, financed by Venetian and other businessmen to extend their commercial empires, through the Inquisition and the Reformation and the new breakaways into Protestantism, to the alliances with the dictatorships of this century and the unique interpretation of the gospels as preached by the Dutch Reform Church in South Africa, the established institutions of Christianity have allied themselves consistently with the needs of the States which they serve and which protect them.

This being so, the continual demands from 'people of good will' in Britain for a lead from the Church on such troublesome issues as the H-Bomb are as naive as the hopes for honest socialist policies from the

☛ Continued on p. 4

We got off to a rather frosty start when an egghead wanted to know what 'Tonight' was. It was explained to him and the other comrades who hadn't the courage to ask, that it was a magazine programme of items lasting six to nine minutes each, which was screened about four or five times a week in the early evening. The production schedule was rather flexible, to allow of topicality, and whilst some of the items were 'live' the Malatesta Club item was to be filmed. Its viewing figures were estimated by the producer at five million. Most of us were unimpressed as most of us were non-viewers.

When the history of anarchism on television comes to be written it will not be a happy one. Whether there will be television in a free society is a point mooter than most. The comrades who have appeared on this 'idiot's lantern' claimed to have had an unfair deal from the proprietors of the peepshow. However these were the Other People so whilst we got sympathy from this lot we had no guarantee that similar misunderstandings would not arise. The whole power lay in the shears of the film-cutters who would prepare our pearl of wisdom for the casting. For his part the producer would work with an interviewer who would ask questions to which we could give pithy answers. It was pointed out that one of the maxims learnt at mother's knee was 'ask silly questions and you'll get silly answers', however it was thought that a rehearsal before the filming would elicit questions and answers that were suitable.

From the start it was insisted that the ideas had to be simple in 'terms that the man and woman in the street would understand'. It was generally implied that the average I.Q. of T.V. viewers was low and the programme could not therefore be pitched too high or our five million captive audience would not know what we were talking about. Furthermore subjects such as religion and sex were definitely 'out' as far as this programme was concerned and proposed questions would not touch on these topics.

We were still a little concerned about the effect the item would have, but the thought of getting Our Message to five million people (however moronic they were thought to be and however garbled the message might be, and however untelegraphic the comrades might be who put it over); seemed something not to be

☛ Continued on p. 2

Hard Facts!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 26

Deficit on Freedom	£520
Contributions received	£340
DEFICIT	£180

June 20 to June 27

London: J.A. 1/7;	London: B.L. £1/0/0;
London: P.F.* £1/0/0;	London: J.S.* 3/-;
Los Angeles: £6/6/0;	Glasgow: L.B. £1/0/0;
Vermont: E.L. 19/-;	Dundee: A.S.L. £3/0/0;
Glasgow: J.S.A. 10/6;	London: T.F. 5/-.

Total	14 5 1
Previously acknowledged	325 5 1

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £339 10 2

*Indicates regular contributor.

EDUCATION: Free, Compulsory, Universal

IN a letter to FREEDOM 1/2/58, Ernie Crosswell raised some pretty basic questions about education. Should parents be at liberty to send their children to the school they thought best? "I should have thought," he said, "that the individual concerned, whose liberty we should be ready to honour, is the child, not the parent," but "one cannot ask a child how it would like to be educated. What to do?" He then made his suggestion that

"all children should be directed to a universally agreed type of school at which the curriculum would be directed by an international body consisting of sociologists, philosophers, educationalists, parents, religious leaders—and anarchists. Should differences of opinion arise (this is conceivable in the case of the religious leaders!), the children would be instructed in each of the disputed subjects and by each of the disputed methods".

I don't think he really believes this is a good idea, but he throws out the challenge "Crazy? Let's have some better suggestions then." One might have expected some of FREEDOM's teacher readers to take up the discussion, but nobody did, and a month ago Ernie repeated his question in a slightly different form. Still no answer, but meanwhile, with the publication of the Labour Party's policy statement on education *Learning to Live*, this matter of Educating Ernie has become one of the questions of the hour. An anxious mother, for instance, writes to the *Daily Telegraph*:

"I view with alarm the increasing use of education as a pawn in the political game. Would it not be possible to put education under a non-political board such as those which run the nationalised industries?"

She wants to nationalise education, Ernie Crosswell wants to internationalise it, the anarchist wants, ideally, to autonomise it. The autonomous self-governing school is the aim, and in view of the obvious limits within which children may be said to govern themselves, this means in practice a school controlled by teachers, by virtue of their functional responsibility to children, and by parents because of their biological responsibility for them. But the issue is more complicated, for in both primitive and complex communities it is recognised that all adults have a responsibility towards children, which because of the vagaries and vicissitudes of individual parentage, may have to be exercised on its behalf or on the child's behalf. Once this is admitted we have of course admitted that education is the concern of the community.

But what community? The State as in France, the local authority as in the United States, or a mixture of both as in Britain? And where does the responsibility of the community begin and end?

Should education be compulsory anyway? (And is the compulsion to be applied to the child or the parent? Bakunin saw the question dialectically:

"The principle of authority, in the education of children, constitutes the natural point of departure; it is legitimate, necessary, when applied to children of a tender age, whose intelligence has not yet openly developed itself. But as the development of everything, and consequently of education, implies the gradual negation of the point of departure, this principle must diminish as fast as education and instruction advance, giving place to increasing liberty. All rational education is at bottom nothing but this progressive immolation of authority for the benefit of liberty, the final object of education necessarily being the formation of free men full of respect and love for the liberty of others. Therefore the first day of the pupil's life, if the school takes infants scarcely able as yet to stammer a few words, should be that of the greatest authority and an almost entire absence of liberty; but its last day should be that of the greatest liberty and the absolute abolition of every vestige of the animal or divine principle of authority."

Ethel Mannin, in her 'utopian survey' *Bread and Roses* takes a more absolutely libertarian line:

"At this point you perhaps protest, 'But if there is no compulsion, what happens if a child does not want to attend school of any kind, and the parents are not concerned to persuade him?' It is quite simple. In that case the child does not attend any school. As he becomes adolescent he may wish to acquire some learning. Or he may develop school-going friends and wish to attend school because they do. But if he doesn't he is nevertheless learning all the time, his natural child's creativeness working in happy alliance with his freedom. No Utopian parent would think of using that moral coercion we call 'persuasion'. By the time he reaches adolescence the child grows tired of running wild, and begins to identify himself with grow-ups; he perceives the usefulness of knowing how to read and write and add, and there is probably some special thing he wants to learn—such as how to drive a train or build a bridge or a house. It is all very much simpler than our professional educationists would have us believe."

The point is really academic, for in practice the decision is that of the parents. Nowadays it is only highly

sophisticated and educated people who bother to argue about whether or not children should be made to learn the three R's. The law in this country does not in fact require parents to send their children to school; it imposes on them an obligation to see that their children while within the compulsory age, are receiving "an appropriate education". The occasional prosecutions of recalcitrant parents usually reveal an apathy or indifference or parental incompetence which hardly provide a good case for the opponents of compulsion, though they do sometimes rope in highly conscientious parents whose views on education do not happen to coincide with those of the local authority. Apart from some of the rich, with their governesses and tutors, there are not many parents with the time or skill to teach their children at home, and of those many must feel it unfair to deprive their children of the pleasure and social experience of belonging to a community of their peers, or may cherish the right of parents to get the kids out of the way for a while, and *vice versa*. Patrick Geddes the biologist and town-planner taught his children at home, and one cannot help feeling rather sorry for them, exposed to his rather overpowering influence even in those hours of the day when most children are out of the parental reach.

★

HISTORICALLY, in this country, the struggle to make education free, compulsory and universal and out of the exclusive control of religious bodies, was long and bitter, and the opposition to it came, not from libertarian objectors, but from the upholders of privilege and dogma, and from those (both parents and employers) who had an economic interest in the labour of children or a vested interest in ignorance. The very reason why it had to be made compulsory ninety years ago was because children were an economic asset. Readers of the works of J.L. and Barbara Hammond, or of chapters 8 and 12 of Marx's *Capital* will not dissent from the assertion that the industrial revolution in this country was made by the children of the poor. As late as 1935 when Lord Halifax, as President of the Board of Education, opposing the raising of the school leaving age from 14 to 15, declared that "public opinion would not tolerate an unconditional raising of the age" and the Bradford textile manufacturers assured him that "there was work for little

fingers there". Anarchist objections to our educational system find ourselves in it. Nevertheless, in the educational policy statement of 1965, we are bound only the way in education of children is abstracted in the educational country, in our own economic framework.

The notion that education should be free, compulsory is very much a legacy of the Education Act of 1870. It goes

The D

Continued from page 10. Missed and, after So, eventually, a was worked out.

*

The day we got about six technical club at first with recording apparatus of cable and that of two boards with number three 'To-

Later the producer, and a secret interviewer was took shots of the with its posters for scientific objection with anarchist neaguages. Then the intellectual Wilfrid or a rather dim seemed to think what it was all a five million hypnotised in the streak a clue unless he asked questions. V of a question. "I what would you with?" Our answer him that he wasn't lines. He skipped was our most embarrassing took six hours to

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

The Anti-corn Law League 1838-46
N. McCord 25/-

Democracy versus Liberty
Salvador de Madariaga 10/-

Teddy Boy's Picnic
Elizabeth Stuckley 16/-

Pelican . . .

L.A.G. Sunday Night Lectures ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

(Continued from previous issue)

FOR those who agree, and I think that this point is so obvious that it doesn't need arguing, that there is no real chance of establishing a "News from Nowhere" type of society in the immediate future but who for any reason of all feel that anarchism has become a part of

protests, one will succeed is a different matter. To say that protest in itself, however futile is to the individual who makes it is to take up a heroic stance which will appeal to only a few. Besides that, it has the disadvantage that it is and could have the effect, in fact I am sure it

graph:

"I view with alarm the increasing use of education as a pawn in the political game. Would it not be possible to put education under a non-political board such as those which run the nationalised industries?"

She wants to nationalise education, Ernie Crosswell wants to internationalise it, the anarchist wants, ideally, to autonomise it. The autonomous self-governing school is the aim, and in view of the obvious limits within which children may be said to govern themselves, this means in practice a school controlled by teachers, by virtue of their functional responsibility to children, and by parents because of their biological responsibility for them. But the issue is more complicated, for in both primitive and complex communities it is recognised that all adults have a responsibility towards children, which because of the vagaries and vicissitudes of individual parentage, may have to be exercised on its behalf or on the child's behalf. Once this is admitted we have of course admitted that education is the concern of the community.

libertarian line:

"At this point you perhaps protest, 'But if there is no compulsion, what happens if a child does not want to attend school of any kind, and the parents are not concerned to persuade him?' It is quite simple. In that case the child does not attend any school. As he becomes adolescent he may wish to acquire some learning. Or he may develop school-going friends and wish to attend school because they do. But if he doesn't he is nevertheless learning all the time, his natural child's creativeness working in happy alliance with his freedom. No Utopian parent would think of using that moral coercion we call 'persuasion'. By the time he reaches adolescence the child grows tired of running wild, and begins to identify himself with grow-ups; he perceives the usefulness of knowing how to read and write and add, and there is probably some special thing he wants to learn—such as how to drive a train or build a bridge or a house. It is all very much simpler than our professional educationists would have us believe."

The point is really academic, for in practice the decision is that of the parents. Nowadays it is only highly

HISTORICALLY, in this country, the struggle to make education free, compulsory and universal and out of the exclusive control of religious bodies, was long and bitter, and the opposition to it came, not from libertarian objectors, but from the upholders of privilege and dogma, and from those (both parents and employers) who had an economic interest in the labour of children or a vested interest in ignorance. The very reason why it had to be made compulsory ninety years ago was because children were an economic asset. Readers of the works of J.L. and Barbara Hammond, or of chapters 8 and 12 of Marx's *Capital* will not dissent from the assertion that the industrial revolution in this country was made by the children of the poor. As late as 1935 when Lord Halifax, as President of the Board of Education, opposing the raising of the school leaving age from 14 to 15, declared that "public opinion would not tolerate an unconditional raising of the age" and the Bradford textile manufacturers assured him that "there was work for little

recording apparatus of cable and that of two boards v number three 'To

Later the producer, and a second interviewer was took shots of the with its posters of scientific objection with anarchist languages. Then the intellectual Wilfrid or a rather dim seemed to think what it was a five million hyperfixed in the streak a clue unless he cant questions. of a question. "I what would you with?" Our ans him that he was lines. He skippe was our most em took six hours to

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

- The Anti-corn Law League 1838-46
N. McCord 25/-
Democracy versus Liberty
Salvator de Madariaga 10/-
Teddy Boy's Picnic
Elizabeth Stucley 16/-

Pelican . . .

- Body and Mind in Western
Thought J. W. Reeves 5/-

Second-Hand . . .

- The Rape of the Earth
G. V. Jacks & R. O. Whyte 8/-
Fifty Mutinies, Rebellions and
Revolutions 8/-
Lover Under Another Name
Ethel Mannin 3/6
Theism or Atheism
Chapman Cohen 3/6
The Astrologer Edward Hyams 3/6
The World Cannot Hear You
Gwyn Thomas 3/-
Now Lead us Home
Gwyn Thomas 3/-
The Popes and their Church
Joseph McCabe 3/-
Saint Colline Gabriel Chevallier 3/-
All the King's Men
Robert Penn Warren 3/6
The Cost of English Morals
Janet Chance 3/6
The Perfect Wagnerite
Bernard Shaw 3/-
Monkey Wu Ch'eng-en 3/-
A Dream of John Ball and a
King's Lesson William Morris 2/6
Allanforth Commune
Findlay Watt 3/6
The Monster, &c. Stephen Watt 3/6
A Manual of Psychology
G. F. Stout 6/6

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

L.A.G. Sunday Night Lectures ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

(Continued from previous issue)

FOR those who agree, and I think that this point is so obvious that it doesn't need arguing, that there is no real chance of establishing a "News from Nowhere" type of society in the immediate future but who for any reason at all feel that anarchism has become a part of them, and that it is too good a part of them to be forsaken are forced to rethink the problem, "Why am I an anarchist?", or "Why should I go on being an anarchist?" We have to admit, and I don't see any reason for being ashamed of it, that at times the rational reasons for being interested in anarchism become pretty weak, and we are maintained by irrational, perhaps sentimental attachments to the movement. Perhaps many of those who are now passively associated with anarchism in Britain fall into this category. I think it is particularly important if one is in this state of mind to really start thinking about the problems involved, and not just to drift, possibly into a position of total apathy.

One possible answer to the problem lies along the lines of admitting that our protests may not change the course of events, but of asserting that we must make them nevertheless, for our own reasons. This idea was current among the Spanish anarchists, and Gerald Brenan, in his book "The Spanish Labyrinth" remarks that the word "protesta" was one of the most frequent to occur in the movement's publications. When the government or the employers did something outrageous, the only thing a good man could do to retain his dignity and self-respect was to protest. I have seen a view similar to this expressed for instance by M. L. Berneri in her essay "Neither East nor West", by Dr. Bronowski in a speech which he made to a protest meeting against some trials in Barcelona, and more recently in talks by Rita Milton.

Put in another way, this is an attempt to reconcile the individualist insistence that we should always act rationally in our own interests, and the feeling that the old ideas of working for the good of others, and even for humanity still contain a lot of value and should be carried on with. Although this is in many ways an admirable solution of the problem, I think that it has some dubious aspects. I cannot really reconcile myself to the idea that a person should get positive satisfaction out of making a protest which he knows will be ineffective. To feel that protest might be effective in the sense that out of every ten cases in which anarchists raise

protests, one will succeed is a different matter. To say that protest in itself, however futile is to the individual who makes it is to take up a heroic stance which will appeal to only a few. Besides that, it has the disadvantage that it is and could have the effect, in fact I am sure it does, we persist with less useful forms of propaganda of concentrating on more useful ones. Never will quote from an essay by David Wieck put "The World Scene from the Libertarian Point of view" in which the protesting attitude is very fairly, I am afraid not too stylishly expressed:

"Assume the worst: that if it were so (if it were so) for example that our neighbours, even our enemies cannot disappoint us as our friends are, forever will be as they are (which we know well); or, the same thing, the prevailing social order immutable in their central principle of slavery, this really so (some argue) our anarchism has nothing, we ought to become one with the ideals of the society and its population. No! Not a thing is better for being inevitable; not so happiness and health would no longer depend on this social machine, its inhuman demands suffocating terms: so on the other hand, that must be as free as he can, make a revolution to its (most possible) extension.

Were it really so—some argue this too—that it is by nature docile, unrebelling, must be led and it does not then follow that we should lead, slaughter them into a (former!) utopia. When we observe the state seeming omnipotent not become its slaves, masters or loyal opposites we protect ourselves, shelter ourselves, undermine its locus of power (minds of subjects).

Or assume that no alternative to destruction. Could we then be "realists" as we are bidden to the relative merits of a bomb now or two years now; support (that is help create) a war, be its fabricate its weapons? No! If our belief is in community and freedom. No! Not by part in a lesser evil (killing strangers to the gain oppressors) but by rejecting all the evils will we them all (and I deny that we will not one day there.)"

I must point out that David Wieck is describing the reasons for being an anarchist, if the worst is true, and that in that essay he is concerned that he doesn't think that it is true. That is the place for the "protest for protest's sake" theory.

Free, Compulsory, Universal . . .

ty? The State as in authority as in the mixture of both as in re does the responsibility begin and end?

be compulsory any- e compulsion to be child or the parent? question dialectically:

of authority, in the ren, constitutes the epture; it is legiti- en applied to children hose intelligence has eloped itself. But as everything, and con- on, implies the grad- e point of departure, diminish as fast as ction advance, giving liberty. All rational om nothing but this ion of authority for y, the final object of y being the forma- of respect and love thers. Therefore the il's life, if the school ely able as yet to ds, should be that of rity and an almost erty; but its last day e the greatest liberty olution of every ves- or divine principle of

ther 'utopian survey' tes a more absolutely

ou perhaps protest, mpulsion, what hap- s not want to attend and the parents are ersuade him?" It is at case the child does pol. As he becomes wish to acquire some ay develop school- ish to attend school But if he doesn't he ing all the time, his tiveness working in his freedom. No ld think of using that all 'persuasion'. By adolescence the child ing wild, and begins with grow-ups; he ss of knowing how and add, and there ecial thing he wants ow to drive a train a house." It is all han our professional ave us believe".

ly academic, for in it is that of the par- it is only highly

sophisticated and educated people who bother to argue about whether or not children should be made to learn the three R's. The law in this country does not in fact require parents to send their children to school; it imposes on them an obligation to see that their children while within the compulsory age, are receiving "an appropriate education". The occasional prosecutions of recalcitrant parents usually reveal an apathy or indifference or parental incompetence which hardly provide a good case for the opponents of compulsion, though they do sometimes rope in highly conscientious parents whose views on education do not happen to coincide with those of the local authority. Apart from some of the rich, with their governesses and tutors, there are not many parents with the time or skill to teach their children at home, and of those many must feel it unfair to deprive their children of the pleasure and social experience of belonging to a community of their peers, or may cherish the right of parents to get the kids out of the way for a while, and *vice versa*. Patrick Geddes the biologist and town-planner taught his children at home, and one cannot help feeling rather sorry for them, exposed to his rather overpowering influence even in those hours of the day when most children are out of the parental reach.

★

HISTORICALLY, in this country, the struggle to make education free, compulsory and universal and out of the exclusive control of religious bodies, was long and bitter, and the opposition to it came, not from libertarian objectors, but from the upholders of privilege and dogma, and from those (both parents and employers) who had an economic interest in the labour of children or a vested interest in ignorance. The very reason why it had to be made compulsory ninety years ago was because children were an economic asset. Readers of the works of J.L. and Barbara Hammond, or of chapters 8 and 12 of Marx's *Capital* will not dissent from the assertion that the industrial revolution in this country was made by the children of the poor. As late as 1935 when Lord Halifax, as President of the Board of Education, opposing the raising of the school leaving age from 14 to 15, declared that "public opinion would not tolerate an unconditional raising of the age" and the Bradford textile manufacturers assured him that "there was work for little

fingers there". And in formulating libertarian objections to the way in which our educational system is organised, we find ourselves in very dubious company. Nevertheless, in thinking about the implications of Ernie Crosswell's questions, as well as those of the Labour Party's policy statement (which, limited in a greater or lesser degree, by recurring economic or 'balance of payments' crises, is likely to be the basis of change in the education system from at least 1960 to 1965), we are bound to postulate not only the way in which we think the education of children should be organised in the abstract, but also which tendencies we support and which we oppose in the educational *status quo* of our own country, in our own time, and within the economic framework of society as it is.

The notion that primary education should be free, compulsory and universal is very much older than the English Act of 1870. It grew up with the print-

ing press and the rise of protestantism. The rich had been educated by the Church and the sons of the rising bourgeoisie in the grammar schools of the Middle Ages. From the 16th century on arose a gradual demand that all should be taught. Martin Luther appealed "To the Councilmen of all Cities in Germany that they establish and maintain Christian Schools", observing that the training children get at home "attempts to make us wise through our experience" a task for which life itself is too short, and which could be accelerated by systematic instruction by means of books. Compulsory universal education was founded in Calvinist Geneva in 1536, and Calvin's Scottish disciple John Knox "planted a school as well as a kirk in every parish". In puritan Massachusetts free compulsory primary education was introduced in 1647. The common school, writes Lewis Mumford in his *Condition of Man*,

"contrary to popular belief, is no belated product of 19th century demo-

Continued on p. 3

The Day We Got on the Telly

Continued from p. 1

missed and, after all, it's all experience! So, eventually, a time-table of comrades was worked out.

* * *

The day we got on the film for telly, about six technicians descended on the club at first with spotlights, a camera, a recording apparatus and yards and yards of cable and that fascinating instrument of two boards which says "Take one, number three 'To-night'."

Later the producer, the assistant producer, and a secretary turned up. The interviewer was the last. Firstly they took shots of the club, the notice-board with its posters for FREEDOM and conscientious objection and the wall covered with anarchist newspapers in all languages. Then the interviewer came, an intellectual Wilfred Pickles, as it were, or a rather dim A. J. P. Taylor. He seemed to think that whilst we knew what it was all about, the vast unseen five million hypnotised hen's beaks firmly fixed in the streak of light wouldn't have a clue unless he asked the really significant questions. We had a real pickle of a question, "If you were in power what would you like to see done away with?" Our answer to this convinced him that he wasn't going on the right lines. He skipped the one about what was our most embarrassing moment. It took six hours to record what the seven

members of the L.A.G. and the Malatesta Club thought were sensible answers to questions which we thought a little foolish. That six hours work of eight people will flash on and off about four million telly screens for about five minutes leaving very little behind.

It seems symptomatic of this encapsulated age that one is expected to take in anarchism with a glance of the eye and a twitch of the ear. It is not that anarchism is merely regarded as trivial, everything is regarded as trivial, save the really trivial which is accorded high importance (sport for instance).

Whether the time of those technicians could have been more fitly employed is doubtful. If it were not the Malatesta Club/L.A.G. item on Anarchism they had been working on they would have been recording some other more banal item. But is this ceaseless flow of triviality and chatter necessary? Is not the urge for perpetual distraction a sign of the inability of the viewers to switch off and face the void that is their usual lives?

However, be that as it may, the Malatesta Club/L.A.G. programme will probably swim into the fishtank any evening when the programme "To-night" is on; producer Gavin Lyle, interviewer Trevor Philpott. But if you (and we), don't like it, don't be surprised—you can switch off!

J.R.

L.A.G. Sunday Night Lectures ARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

(ed from previous issue)

free, and I think that this point is so doesn't need arguing, that there is establishing a "News from Nowhere" in the immediate future but who for any anarchist has been a part of

protests, one will succeed is a different matter entirely. To say that protest in itself, however futile is valuable to the individual who makes it is to take up a rather heroic stance which will appeal to only a few people. Besides that, it has the disadvantage that it is irrational and could have the effect, in fact I am sure it does, that

chism, not as a basis but as something on which to fall back on in moments of despair. We need something more positive and constructive to provide a framework for the day-to-day activities of the anarchist movement.

Perhaps it can be regarded as a practical example of the need for, I won't say revising or rethinking anarchism so much as rebuilding it that I have given half this talk without saying anything constructive about either anarchism or what we can hope to do with it. What I would like to do during the second half is to try to outline some ideas which I think might be useful to anarchists,

you perhaps protest, compulsion, what happens not want to attend school, and the parents are to persuade him?" It is in that case the child does not go to school. As he becomes a man, he wishes to acquire some skill, but he does not wish to attend school. But if he doesn't go to school all the time, his inactivity is working in his favour. No one would think of using that as an argument. By adolescence the child is wild, and begins to grow up; he knows how to drive a train, and add, and there is a special thing he wants to do to drive a train to a house. It is all that our professional men have us believe".

ly academic, for in n is that of the par- it is only highly

HISTORICALLY, in this country, the struggle to make education free, compulsory and universal and out of the exclusive control of religious bodies, was long and bitter, and the opposition to it came, not from libertarian objectors, but from the upholders of privilege and dogma, and from those (both parents and employers) who had an economic interest in the labour of children or a vested interest in ignorance. The very reason why it had to be made compulsory ninety years ago was because children were an economic asset. Readers of the works of J.L. and Barbara Hammond, or of chapters 8 and 12 of Marx's *Capital* will not dissent from the assertion that the industrial revolution in this country was made by the children of the poor. As late as 1935 when Lord Halifax, as President of the Board of Education, opposing the raising of the school leaving age from 14 to 15, declared that "public opinion would not tolerate an unconditional raising of the age" and the Bradford textile manufacturers assured him that "there was work for little

also at his own spotlights, a camera, a recording apparatus and yards and yards of cable and that fascinating instrument of two boards which says "Take one, number three 'To-night'."

Later the producer, the assistant producer, and a secretary turned up. The interviewer was the last. Firstly they took shots of the club, the notice-board with its posters for FREEDOM and conscientious objection and the wall covered with anarchist newspapers in all languages. Then the interviewer came, an intellectual Wilfred Pickles, as it were, or a rather dim A. J. P. Taylor. He seemed to think that whilst we knew what it was all about, the vast unseen five million hypnotised hen's beaks firmly fixed in the streak of light wouldn't have a clue unless he asked the really significant questions. We had a real pickle of a question. "If you were in power what would you like to see done away with?" Our answer to this convinced him that he wasn't going on the right lines. He skipped the one about what was our most embarrassing moment. It took six hours to record what the seven

It seems symptomatic of this encapsulated age that one is expected to take in anarchism with a glance of the eye and a twitch of the ear. It is not that anarchism is merely regarded as trivial, everything is regarded as trivial, save the really trivial which is accorded high importance (sport for instance).

Whether the time of those technicians could have been more fitly employed is doubtful. If it were not the Malatesta Club/L.A.G. item on Anarchism they had been working on they would have been recording some other more banal item. But is this ceaseless flow of triviality and chatter necessary? Is not the urge for perpetual distraction a sign of the inability of the viewers to switch off and face the void that is their usual lives?

However, be that as it may, the Malatesta Club/L.A.G. programme will probably swim into the fishtank any evening when the programme "To-night" is on; producer Gavin Lyle, interviewer Trevor Philpott. But if you (and we), don't like it, don't be surprised—you can switch off!

J.R.

L.A.G. Sunday Night Lectures ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

(continued from previous issue)

free, and I think that this point is so obvious that it doesn't need arguing, that there is no need for establishing a "News from Nowhere" for the immediate future but who for any anarchist has become a part of the world. It is too good a part of them to be forgotten. I must rethink the problem, "Why am I an anarchist?" I should I go on being an anarchist?" I don't see any reason for being an anarchist. I don't see the rational reasons for anarchism become pretty weak, and the irrational, perhaps sentimental movement. Perhaps many of those who are actively associated with anarchism in this category. I think it is particularly in this state of mind to really start to think about the problems involved, and not just to take a position of total apathy.

As to the problem lies along the lines that our protests may not change the world, but of asserting that we must make our own reasons. This idea was put forward by the Spanish anarchists, and Gerald L. K. Smith in "The Spanish Labyrinth" remarks that "the anarchist movement was one of the most frequent of the movement's publications. When the employers did something outrageous, and man could do to retain his dignity and to protest. I have seen a view expressed for instance by M. L. Berneri in "East nor West", by Dr. Bronowski in "The protest meeting in Barcelona, and more recently in

any, this is an attempt to reconcile the interests that we should always act in our own interests, and the feeling that the world is for the good of others, and even though this is in many ways an attempt to solve the problem, I think that it has failed. I cannot really reconcile myself to the fact that a person should get positive satisfaction from the fact that he knows will be ineffective. The protest might be effective in the very few cases in which anarchists raise

protests, one will succeed is a different matter entirely. To say that protest in itself, however futile is valuable to the individual who makes it is to take up a rather heroic stance which will appeal to only a few people. Besides that, it has the disadvantage that it is irrational and could have the effect, in fact I am sure it does, that we persist with less useful forms of propaganda instead of concentrating on more useful ones. Nevertheless, I will quote from an essay by David Wieck published in "The World Scene from the Libertarian Point of View" in which the protesting attitude is very fairly, although I am afraid not too stylishly expressed:

"Assume the worst: that if it were so (if it were so) for example that our neighbours, even our friends (our enemies cannot disappoint us as our friends can) are, forever will be as they are (which we know too well); or, the same thing, the prevailing social orders are immutable in their central principle of slavery: were this really so (some argue) our anarchism has no meaning, we ought to become one with the ideals and acts of the society and its population. No! Not so that a thing is better for being inevitable; not so that our happiness and health would no longer depend on rejection of this social machine, its inhuman demands, its suffocating terms: so on the other hand, that a man must be as free as he can, make a revolution of indefinite (most possible) extension.

Were it really so—some argue this too—that the mass is by nature docile, unrebelling, must be led and herded, it does not then follow that we should lead, herd and slaughter them into a (former!) utopia. Even so, when we observe the state seeming omnipotent we cannot become its slaves, masters or loyal opposition; again we protect ourselves, shelter ourselves, undermine it in its locus of power (minds of subjects).

Or assume that no alternative to destruction can be: Could we then be "realists" as we are bidden to be, argue the relative merits of a bomb now or two years from now; support (that is help create) a war, be its soldiers, fabricate its weapons? No! If our belief is in life, community and freedom. No! Not by participating in a lesser evil (killing strangers to the gain of our oppressors) but by rejecting all the evils will we mitigate them all (and I deny that we will not one day abolish them).

I must point out that David Wieck is describing here the reasons for being an anarchist, if the worst can be true, and that in that essay he is concerned to show that he doesn't think that it is true. That is the proper place for the "protest for protest's sake" theory of anar-

chism, not as a basis but as something on which to fall back on in moments of despair. We need something more positive and constructive to provide a framework for the day-to-day activities of the anarchist movement.

Perhaps it can be regarded as a practical example of the need for, I won't say revising or rethinking anarchism so much as rebuilding it that I have given half this talk without saying anything constructive about either anarchism or what we can hope to do with it. What I would like to do during the second half is to try to outline some ideas which I think might be useful to anarchists, and then to go into greater detail in showing how they can be applied to the everyday activities of the movement. I think it right to say at this point that I do not want to appear to be claiming too much for what I have to say. Other anarchists have provoked revolutionary uprisings and come near to building anarchist societies temporarily, while we sit here in nice rooms in London and talk about them.

First I think that we need to recapture the courage and clearheadedness which has distinguished anarchists in the past. The courage to which I refer is not so much the courage to bear physical danger or even what is more often referred to as "moral courage"; that is the ability to withstand criticism and unfair attacks, but the courage to believe in one's own ideas. A. S. Neill has written in the preface to "The Free Child" "... Many have said and written that I am a brave man to pioneer in education. I could never see it because I could never see any danger to face. They called it moral courage, a kind of courage that has never been considered of much value ... Moral courage is misnamed; it should be faith courage, that which springs from belief in what one is doing. A so-called moral coward is one who loses his faith, a doubter, a sinner on the fence ..."

The writer has been very fortunate if it is literally true that he has never seen any danger to face in pioneering work in education. What many of us, when wondering about anarchism think is that we are afraid that anything we do might be useless. We are not afraid of either physical or verbal attack from without, but we are afraid of ourselves. We do not want to feel ourselves to be cranks, or psychologically peculiar people. When capitalist society was at its most vicious, it was easy to be an "enemy of society" because society was so revolting. Now however, the Welfare State and the material benefits, and in some directions cultural benefits that it confers here and there make it more difficult to declare oneself an anarchist, that is one who rejects the whole structure which involves authority. This makes it all the more important that we should be quite clear about what we do mean by anarchism.

(To be continued)

July 5, 1958

Continued from p. 1

His first act, when he was offered—and accepted—the Premiership by the Communist Central Committee, during the popular uprising in October 1956, was to declare a state of emergency. And these were his words:

Because we do not believe that Nagy was either a political innocent, or a stooge, we feel justified in commenting on his fate that he has now been hoist with his own petard. We neither gloat over the fact, nor imagine that the world is any the worse for his death (unlike the *News Chronicle* which discovered "a message of hope . . . by the murder"†), since we are horrified by judicial murder without exception, and because we do not believe that individuals, least of all politicians, have ever been responsible for changing the social structure of the world (if challenged we will be glad to enlarge on this bald statement!).

IN fact, if only our values were less distorted by a Press which fosters, and thrives, on the cult of the personality, we would consider the continued massacre by the hundred every week of humble *fellagah* in Algeria as something more offensive to our better feelings than the cold-blooded liquidation of the

The process is always particularly noticeable in politicians, who of necessity at election times must give some account of their theoretical aims and beliefs. Sooner or later (usually sooner), a situation occurs in which they must make a choice of sticking to their principles (though there are very few politicians who can be said to have, or have had any great wealth of these political luxuries), or obeying the Party Whip. This is one of the

The corrupting influence of power takes many forms, foremost of which is the lust for more and more power and an increasing indifference to the methods by which it is achieved. And there are all the subtler variations of corruption in high places and low, from the degeneration borne of lost illusions and a consequent unconcern, to the equally degenerating effects of a conviction that one is always right. But the most obvious sign of corruption, and the only one which is generally brought to the attention of the public, is that of personal financial gain. The acceptance of bribes of money or goods in return for ser-

Nevertheless most of this is done in an informal nature. Most of this kind, at present, is done in a haphazard manner throughout the breadth of the State. The amount of gifts in kind is much less than the personage than Sher-

"If the education of our youth be entirely confined to the prudence of their parents, or the accidental benevolence of private individuals, will it not be

"Thirdly, the project of education ought unified and encouraged on account of the alliance with nations. This is an alliance of a new nature than the old alliance of church and State, put so powerful a new direction of so ambitious behoves us to consider. Government will not be able to strengthen its hands against its institutions . . . The failure of a system of education to be analogous to their political capacity, which their conduct indicated will be the failure of their institutions are false. It is true that our youth ought to be taught to venerate the common good; excellent; they should be taught to venerate truth . . . (E)

of this kind, at present
furore throughout the
breadth of the State
ance of gifts in kind
personage than She

desires to learn will learn. The questions he receives are answered with meaning. He that desires to teach will teach. His participation with enthusiasm in the moment political takes to assign to even the functions of all the things with supineness and

"Thirdly, the project of education ought not to be encouraged on account of an alliance with nationalism. This is an alliance of a new nature than the old alliance of church and State, so powerful a direction of so ambitious a policy behoves us to consider. The Government will not be able to strengthen its hands by its institutions . . . The Government is the author of a system of education which is bound to fail to be analogous to the needs of their political capacities. The manner in which their conduct is directed will be the result of the manner in which their institutions are directed. It is true that our youth are not inclined to venerate the conventional; they are excellent; they should be encouraged to venerate truth . . . (Even in a country where liberty chiefly consists in the reasonable to be assumed, and in the important errors, and in the perpetuation has the most of those errors perpetuate those errors upon one mode

His arguments are this length, not only in the interest of the movement of the anarchist issue, but because the example subsequent just on the other hand does the question of how every child can have whatever educational its individual needs. answer Ernie Crosswe international body, and ally agreed curriculum only be of any use if there could ever be of truths to be inculcally correct method and that the purpose "to form all minds un

(The Labour Party's
will be discussed

Godwin goes on:

"Secondly, the idea of national education is founded in an inattention to the nature of mind. Whatever each man does for himself is done well; whatever his neighbours or his country undertake to do for him is done ill. It is our wisdom to incite men to act for themselves, not to retain them in a state of perpetual pupillage. He that learns because he

(News Chronicle).

The Sherman Adams Case Spotlights an Old Problem:

Government is Power - and Power Corrupts

agree with the
ention put for-
ton that power
nd in fact some
admit that even
uld be corrupted
ad it! It is one
given by anar-
omptente disbeli-
entions of gov-
alone the actions

tend that certain
ions of power do
er, and occasion-
specific good for
be so, but only
es and compara-
ises. The excep-
as to make the
a principle. Over
t is certain that
achieved power
by it or is forced

ways particularly
ticians, who of
times must give
their theoretical
Sooner or later
situation occurs
t make a choice
their principles
very few politi-
said to have, or
wealth of these
or obeying the
s is one of the

major weaknesses of the Parliamen-
ary system, for in order to have a
"strong" government the Party in
power must vote "together", which
is not even remotely democratic; yet
if the Party votes as it pleases
nothing is ever decided and the
situation develops as in France
where stable Governments have be-
come unknown. This of course is
precisely the argument of the Fasc-
ist-inclined, who then say that it is
therefore necessary to have a single
leader who makes all the decisions,
right or wrong, but at least some-
thing gets done . . . The results of
this type of government are well-
known, and the degree of corruption
with which they are associated is
infinite.

The corrupting influence of
power takes many forms, foremost
of which is the lust for more and
more power and an increasing in-
difference to the methods by which
it is achieved. And there are all
the subtler variations of corruption
in high places and low, from the de-
generation borne of lost illusions
and a consequent unconcern, to the
equally degenerating effects of a
conviction that one is always right.
But the most obvious sign of corrup-
tion, and the only one which is
generally brought to the attention of
the public, is that of personal finan-
cial gain. The acceptance of bribes
of money or goods in return for ser-

vices rendered by virtue of holding
an office or position from which to
favour the briber.

★

IN the U.S.A. it is accepted practice
for men in power to render their
services in exchange for induce-
ments of one kind or another.
Bribery and corruption is regarded
as one of the only means by which
it is possible to "get on". This auto-
matically produces a climate in
which the men with money assist the
men with power, and *vice versa*,
each hoping to gain more money
and more power. It is a vicious
circle from which great rewards may
be derived, and the only sin is to be
found out. It takes place through-
out the world, but nowhere does it
flourish so exotically as in the
U.S.A. In that country, in certain
forms, it even has official sanction,
as when a millionaire chain-store
owner makes a sufficiently large
donation to a political Party, he may
eventually be rewarded with a job
in the Government for which he is
particularly unsuited.

Nevertheless most of the corrup-
tion by personal gain is of a more
informal nature. Most recent case
of this kind, at present creating a
furore throughout the length and
breadth of the States, is the accept-
ance of gifts in kind by no less a
personage than Sherman Adams, the

President's Assistant, second most
powerful man in the Administration,
and self-appointed, chief-guardian
of the integrity and incorruptibility
of the Administration itself.

It is admitted by Adams that he
has in the past accepted two rugs
and a vicuña coat, and permitted his
hotel bills at the Waldorf-Astoria
and another hotel in Boston to be
paid for by a rich businessman call-
ed Bernard Goldfine. In his appear-
ance before the House Special Sub-
committee on Legislative Oversight,
Adams altered his original argument
that statements attacking him were
"unwarranted and unfair insinua-
tions", and adopted the line that he
had been "imprudent", that the
"error was one of judgment not of
intent". He insisted that Goldfine,
a personal friend for many years,
had not benefited from their rela-
tionship. Under continued question-
ing this statement became unlikely
in the extreme. Bernard Goldfine's
business activities have been under
investigation for the last two years,
and it would appear that at the very
least some of his methods are
ethically, if not legally, dishonest.

It might be thought that Sherman
Adams must inevitably be for the
high jump—especially in view of the
much-publicised pronouncement by
President Eisenhower, his immediate
boss, on just such matters as these:

"I can't believe that anybody on
my staff would ever be guilty of an
indiscretion. But if ever anything
came to my attention of that kind,
any part of this Government or that
individual would be gone."

May 4th, 1956.

" . . . he (Adams) has been, as he
stated yesterday, imprudent . . . I
personally like Governor Adams . . .
I respect him because of his personal
and official integrity . . . I need
him . . . "

June, 1958.

So Sherman Adams stays, despite
his "indiscretion".

One of the main planks upon
which the Republicans won the 1952
election was their indictment of the
graft and corruption of the Truman
Administration. There is no reason
to suppose that the Eisenhower ver-
sion is any different, but it will now
be difficult for the Republicans to
throw mud at the Democrats on this
issue in the 1960 elections since the
same mud can now be made to stick
so easily on their own Administra-
tion. What has hitherto been re-
garded as a probable Democratic
victory in 1960 has now become
almost a certainty.

Education: Free, Compulsory, Universal

Continued
from p. 2

out that it played
absolutist-mechan-
ich Wilhelm I of
her's precept, made
ompulsory in his
unded 1700 schools
f the poor. Two
XIV in 1694 and
is XV in 1724, re-
dance at school.
gger in such mat-
of private charity
m founded by the
g Christian Know-
en incorporated in
e of the earliest
ters, had thought
l function of the
authority was now
he work that had
the wiping out of
the greater part

"If children are brought up in common
in the bosom of equality; if they are im-
bued with the laws of the State and the
precepts of the General Will . . . we
cannot doubt that they will cherish one
another mutually as brothers . . . to
become in time defenders and fathers of
the country of which they will have been
so long the children".

This notion is at the root of the
American philosophy of education and
is the social basis of the Labour Party's
present proposals for 'comprehensive
secondary education for all'.

★

WILLIAM GODWIN, who, in his
Enquirer attacks the concealed
authoritarianism of Rousseau's educa-
tional theories, criticises in his *Enquiry
Concerning Political Justice* (1792), the
idea of national education. He sum-
marises the arguments in favour, which
are those of Rousseau, adding to them
the question:

"If the education of our youth be en-
tirely confined to the prudence of their
parents, or the accidental benevolence
of private individuals, will it not be

desires to learn will listen to the instruc-
tions he receives and apprehend their
meaning. He that teaches because he
desires to teach will discharge his occu-
pation with enthusiasm and energy. But
the moment political institution under-
takes to assign to every man his place,
the functions of all will be discharged
with supineness and indifference . . .

"Thirdly, the project of a national
education ought uniformly to be dis-
couraged on account of its obvious
alliance with national government. This
is an alliance of a more formidable
nature than the old and much contested
alliance of church and state. Before we
put so powerful a machine under the
direction of so ambitious an agent, it
behoves us to consider well what we do.
Government will not fail to employ it
to strengthen its hands and perpetuate
its institutions . . . Their view as instiga-
tor of a system of education will not
fail to be analogous to their views in
their political capacity: the data upon
which their conduct as statesmen is vin-
dicated will be the data upon which
their institutions are founded. It is not
true that our youth ought to be instruc-
ted to venerate the constitution, however
excellent; they should be instructed to
venerate truth . . . (Even) in the countries
where liberty chiefly prevails, it is

philosophers of the
ed themselves with
m, the two acutest
ranged themselves
the question of the
on. Rousseau for
inst it. Rousseau,
s a completely in-
human society is

their principles
very few politi-
said to have, or
t wealth of these
or obeying the
s is one of the

But the most obvious sign of corrup-
tion, and the only one which is
generally brought to the attention of
the public, is that of personal finan-
cial gain. The acceptance of bribes
of money or goods in return for ser-

informal nature. Most recent case
of this kind at present creating a
furore throughout the length and
breadth of the States, is the accept-
ance of gifts in kind by no less a
personage than Sherman Adams, the

It might be thought that Sherman
Adams must inevitably be for the
high jump—especially in view of the
much-publicised pronouncement by
President Eisenhower, his immediate
boss, on just such matters as these:

"I can't believe that anybody on
my staff would ever be guilty of an
indiscretion. But if ever anything
came to my attention of that kind,
any part of this Government or that
individual would be gone."

May 4th, 1956.

"... he (Adams) has been, as he
stated yesterday, imprudent... I
personally like Governor Adams...
I respect him because of his personal
and official integrity... I need
him..."

June, 1958.

So Sherman Adams stays, despite
his "indiscretion".

One of the main planks upon
which the Republicans won the 1952
election was their indictment of the
graft and corruption of the Truman
Administration. There is no reason
to suppose that the Eisenhower ver-
sion is any different, but it will now
be difficult for the Republicans to
throw mud at the Democrats on this
issue in the 1960 elections since the
same mud can now be made to stick
so easily on their own Administra-
tion. What has hitherto been re-
garded as a probable Democratic
victory in 1960 has now become
almost a certainty.

But the importance of the Adams
affair rests upon the lesson it pro-
vides in corruption. Probably Sher-
man Adams was one of the least
likely men to fall into *this kind* of
corrupt behaviour. His reputation
for integrity was up to this moment
extraordinarily high, he appeared to
be the dedicated servant of the Ad-
ministration. His fall from grace
is consequently all the more drama-
tic.

If the second most powerful man
in the Government of the United
States is to be corrupted by a few
thousand dollars, it is not hard to
believe that in one way or another,
sooner or later, all men in power
become corrupt. The crime of
Sherman Adams by some standards
is not very terrible, but it is a
dreary indication of a recurring
theme. Government is power and
power corrupts.

**It's more Readers
and Support for the
Deficit Fund that
FREEDOM Urgently
needs!**

tion: Free, Compulsory, Universal

Continued
from p. 2

out that it played
absolutist-mechan-
ich Wilhelm I of
her's precept, made
compulsory in his
founded 1700 schools
of the poor. Two
XIV in 1694 and
his XV in 1724, re-
dance at school,
gler in such mat-
of private charity
m founded by the
g Christian Know-
ing incorporated in
e of the earliest of
sters, had thought
al function of the
authority was now
the work that had
the wiping out of
n the greater part

"If children are brought up in common
in the bosom of equality; if they are im-
bued with the laws of the State and the
precepts of the General Will... we
cannot doubt that they will cherish one
another mutually as brothers... to
become in time defenders and fathers of
the country of which they will have been
so long the children".

This notion is at the root of the
American philosophy of education and
is the social basis of the Labour Party's
present proposals for 'comprehensive
secondary education for all'.

★

WILLIAM GODWIN, who, in his
Enquirer attacks the concealed
authoritarianism of Rousseau's educa-
tional theories, criticises in his *Enquiry
Concerning Political Justice* (1792), the
idea of national education. He sum-
marises the arguments in favour, which
are those of Rousseau, adding to them
the question:

"If the education of our youth be en-
tirely confined to the prudence of their
parents, or the accidental benevolence
of private individuals, will it not be
a necessary consequence, that some will
be educated to virtue, others to vice, and
others again entirely neglected?"

Godwin answers:

"The injuries that result from a system
of national education are, in the first
place, that all public establishments in-
clude in them the idea of permanence.
They endeavour, it may be, to secure and
to diffuse whatever of advantage to
society is already known, but they forget
that more remains to be known... But
public education has always expended
its energies in the support of preju-
dice; it teaches its pupils not the forti-
tude that shall bring every proposition
to the test of examination, but the art of
vindicating such tenets as may chance
to be previously established... This
feature runs through every species of
public establishment; and, even in the
petty institution of Sunday schools, the
chief lessons that are taught are a super-
stitious veneration for the Church of
England, and to bow to every man in a
handsome coat... Refer them to read-
ing, to conversation, to meditation, but
teach them neither creeds nor catechisms,
neither moral nor political".

If you think that this is by now a
merely historical point, read Clause 25
of the Education Act of 1944 which de-
clares that "The school day in every
County School and in every Voluntary
School shall begin with collective wor-
ship on the part of all pupils present."

Godwin goes on:

"Secondly, the idea of national educa-
tion is founded in an inattention to the
nature of mind. Whatever each man
does for himself is done well; whatever
his neighbours or his country undertake
to do for him is done ill. It is our wis-
dom to incite men to act for themselves,
not to retain them in a state of perpetual
pupillage. He that learns because he

desires to learn will listen to the instruc-
tions he receives and apprehend their
meaning. He that teaches because he
desires to teach will discharge his occu-
pation with enthusiasm and energy. But
the moment political institution under-
takes to assign to every man his place,
the functions of all will be discharged
with supineness and indifference...

"Thirdly, the project of a national
education ought uniformly to be dis-
couraged on account of its obvious
alliance with national government. This
is an alliance of a more formidable
nature than the old and much contested
alliance of church and state. Before we
put so powerful a machine under the
direction of so ambitious an agent, it
behoves us to consider well what we do.
Government will not fail to employ it
to strengthen its hands and perpetuate
its institutions... Their view as instiga-
tor of a system of education will not
fail to be analogous to their views in
their political capacity: the data upon
which their conduct as statesmen is vin-
dicated will be the data upon which
their institutions are founded. It is not
true that our youth ought to be instruc-
ted to venerate the constitution, however
excellent; they should be instructed to
venerate truth... (Even) in the countries
where liberty chiefly prevails, it is
reasonably to be assumed that there are
important errors, and a national educa-
tion has the most direct tendency to
perpetuate those errors and to form all
minds upon one model."

His arguments are worth quoting at
this length, not only as the classic state-
ment of the anarchist position on this
issue, but because they have had such
ample subsequent justification. Godwin
on the other hand does not really answer
the question of how we can ensure that
every child can have free access to
whatever educational facilities will suit
its individual needs. He does however
answer Ernie Crosswell's point about an
international body, and an internation-
ally agreed curriculum. They would
only be of any use if we assumed that
there could ever be *one* permanent set
of truths to be inculcated, *one* scientifi-
cally correct method of teaching them,
and that the purpose of education was
"to form all minds upon *one* model".

Happily this can never be so, and his
ill-assorted Unesco committee of experts
would be bogged down in a permanent
deadlock, for there are so many teach-
ing methods, so many fashions coming
and going, that agreement is often im-
possible between two teachers, let alone
between countries. The 'right' method
varies from subject to subject, from
school to school, from teacher to teacher
and from child to child. If this were
not so education would be like making
pastry. Mix flour, fat and water and
bash 'em into shape. C.W.

(The Labour Party's education policy
will be discussed in next week's
FREEDOM).

philosophers of the
ed themselves with
m, the two acutest
ranged themselves
the question of the
ion. Rousseau for
ainst it. Rousseau,
es a completely in-
human society is
tire life is devoted
vertheless concern
aspect, arguing,
Political Economy
education "under
d by the govern-

L.N?†

ments to get up
pursuit of their
ret is to see how
can be made to
wax indignant
ick is a trick even
uses. When we
his, we shall have
ep towards our
humiliating role
struments in the
ns and the dis-
s and dispensers
ch the public to
e shadow of a
case is the latest
ble-think, of this
dignation!

garian—though not
ess important—who
y of Joel Brand
Dead", without a
a not only for what
eir victims but for
h, and the rest of
rder to do nothing
deal with this im-

Apologia for 'Good' Government

DEAR COMRADES,

I was interested to read recently in *FREEDOM* that your paper probably has more non-anarchist readers than anarchist readers. As I belong to the former category several interesting questions naturally arise (and I'm sure they apply to others too)—why do I keep subscribing to a paper whose principles and ideas I don't altogether adhere to? What is there in anarchism that I don't like? Does anarchism fail in its propaganda in some way?

These questions have intrigued me for some time and I thought it might be of interest to set down a personal balance sheet concerning the impact of anarchism on myself. First of all let's examine the credit side. The fundamental reason I subscribe to *FREEDOM* is that I agree with the outlook of the paper as a whole—the idea that government is an expensive farce dedicated to maintaining power for the mediocrities of the establishment, the idea that only in freedom do people develop themselves to the full, the idea that it is by co-operation and not by competition that we become truly human beings, the idea that technological advancement is of little use as a factor in increasing human happiness unless tempered by the ideal of the welfare of the community as a whole. These are the basic reasons why I like *FREEDOM*. In addition of course I respect the integrity, understanding and humour of those who write your articles (C.W. should especially be singled out for attention, whoever he or she may be). Indeed the whole tone of the paper may be the fundamental reason why *FREEDOM* is appealing, since after all if people are really understanding of others then all the dogma in the world doesn't matter a damn.

The debit side however seems to lie in the application of these ideas to present society. Many articles in *FREEDOM* seem to imply that all governments are equally bad and therefore nothing much can be done until government as such is finally done away with. This may not be the intention of such articles; I am only trying to describe their impact on me. From this premise also seems to stem the idea that since one government is as bad as any other, then the outcome of any war is a matter of indifference to the anarchist. The result of all this is of course that the anarchist seems to be reduced to sitting on the fence shouting sardonic (but often very witty) remarks in all directions, but unable and unwilling to do anything because of his basic attitude.

My disagreement with this attitude is due to the fact that I do not believe that all governments are equally bad. After living in three different countries—Britain, Canada and the United States—I am convinced that some governments are much worse than others. As far as personal freedom is concerned Canada for example has a lot more to recommend it than does the United States. In fact from a purely personal point of view—attitude towards public health, education system, etc.—local government

cians, since in an anarchist society neither variety will exist, but it makes a hell of a lot of difference right here and now. Where the downright evil type is in power, freedom of thought becomes almost impossible. In this city we take great pride in the fact that we have no controversial publications (might make people think—eh what?) and no subversive bookshops (can't have those evil Reds retailing their atheistic conspiracies). The newspapers don't allow letters to the editor signed with a pseudonym (very undemocratic practice) and the teachers have to sign loyalty oaths to keep their jobs (loyalty presumably to the gods of bootlicking and bumsucking).

This kind of paralysing stupidity makes it difficult for libertarian ideas to stay alive far less flourish. One of my acquaintances recently told me that she strongly believed in the ideal of the survival of the fittest as applied to human beings! Fortunately her ideas are belied by her actions, but the fact that such unadulterated fascism is still taken for granted is a tragic commentary on modern civilization.

As a result of all this I am forced to the conclusion that some sort of stand, however feeble, has to be taken. I have voted in certain elections and will continue to do so not because I believe in government as such but because there are occasions when one kind of government is preferable to another. I adhere to certain ideas not because they are correct or even logical but because they are the only ones possible in hopeless circumstances.

Consider for example the question of capital punishment. I don't believe that the death penalty for murder is always wrong. In Britain and Scandinavia the death penalty may well have little effect on the murder rate but in other parts of the world this may not always be true. The city where I live is in permanent competition with another southern American city for the title: "The Murder Capital of the World", i.e. as to which city has the greatest number of murders per year per 100,000 of the population. Incidentally many deaths which would be called murder elsewhere are not so regarded here, e.g. shooting any man who is in bed with your wife. This is classed as shooting in self-defence since clearly the other fellow was attacking your wife with a dangerous weapon! Actually the death penalty is in force in this state but is seldom applied, certain sections of the law being very poorly enforced. I honestly cannot see any way of improving this state of affairs, given the present set-up, without an authoritarian solution. Again the fact that the tensions and pressures of living here would not exist under anarchism is largely irrelevant. The question still keeps arising:—what should be done here and now?

I am sure other people must have similar questions in mind when faced with the ideas of anarchism. In conclusion I hope you will accept the fact that these questions have not been put

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

The Golden Age

COMRADES,

It is an engrossing circumstance—for me, at least—that your issue 21/6/58 has on the same page of it letters from W.M. Skegness and Arthur W. Uloth. Mr. Uloth I always look upon as the "Golden Age" man, and I am going to remember W.M. by this first letter of his to *FREEDOM* because of its unconscious contradiction of Mr. Uloth.

"Golden Age" must be a purely subjective term, depending so wholly as it does upon what is personally meant by "golden". In Mr. Uloth's sense of the word it means anarchism; a time when each man was in himself all-sufficient, wholly independent, acquiring all he felt in need of by work of his own head and hands. In the days of such men there were few people on earth, and there was no "golden age", because there was no gold as men have since become to know gold. There was no money, and the "golden age", which is the age we live in now, began when pressure of population created problems which compelled men to invent a medium of exchange as a substitute for cumbersome barter.

W.M.'s "Quite clearly one and all are so pleasantly occupied pursuing money and making money and enjoying the comforts money can bring that any agitation, left or right of centre, is frowned on with the greatest disgust," must be numbered the chief of all pregnant words ever printed in *FREEDOM*. Incidentally, though W.M. destroys his own bogey, authoritarianism, by exposing it as an effect and not the cause it is so erroneously held to be. Only when the cause of authoritarianism is seen for what it is will there be possibility of its extermination.

Yours fraternally,

22nd June.

DAVID MACCONNELL.

Quest

DEAR COMRADES,

On Sunday the rare honour, for a appearing on a T ed for young peo "Sunday Break" pu vision from Birmin

A few weeks be definition of Anar on the programme ing it. Not with distinction for mys that the ideals tha in Portugal, Spain have a fair hearing. I was allowed to p chism and this, be my argument.

1. Anarchists a
2. We do not a ing for violence's s
3. We believe t Government in the too much Govern find it difficult to ciple of organisat ment.)
4. Anarchists b vidual has the right opinions of the ma refusal does no har
5. Anarchists should be based on Communes federat I pointed to the Bri the point that Krop he said, that wh Britain and her co an, as in the cas lost Ireland. How were loose, as in th two countries had and partners.

This then is the but even more im is the argument th during rehearsals

Render Unto Caesar

Labour or Communist Parties, and the recent statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury on H-Bomb tests was as honest as could be expected.

'Obey Caesar and God'

Dr. Fisher, in an interview on television, said:—

'I think nothing would be lost by suspending nuclear tests for a time. Someone must take the first step.

Nuclear weapons and tests are terrible. I only wish we had taken the lead in this matter and I would like to see us take it now while there is a possibility of us doing so in a way which will not jeopardise the Government's responsibility to protect our security.

All war is detestable, horrible and sinful in the sight of God.

Sup, Nevertheless

Now this seem tively honest att sup with the de spoon, but you But then Dr. Fish

'I know as well a character he is.

I regard with al political behaviour with terrorism.' he was being far

For Makarios' Enosis movemen EOKA in parti nothing more t unto Caesar that It is, however, and therein lies Fisher's moralisin

But he has n

the integrity, understanding and humour of those who write your articles (C.W. should especially be singled out for attention, whoever he or she may be). Indeed the whole tone of the paper may be the fundamental reason why FREEDOM is appealing, since after all if people are really understanding of others then all the dogma in the world doesn't matter a damn.

The debit side however seems to lie in the application of these ideas to present society. Many articles in FREEDOM seem to imply that all governments are equally bad and therefore nothing much can be done until government as such is finally done away with. This may not be the intention of such articles; I am only trying to describe their impact on me. From this premise also seems to stem the idea that since one government is as bad as any other, then the outcome of any war is a matter of indifference to the anarchist. The result of all this is of course that the anarchist seems to be reduced to sitting on the fence shouting sardonic (but often very witty) remarks in all directions, but unable and unwilling to do anything because of his basic attitude.

My disagreement with this attitude is due to the fact that I do not believe that all governments are equally bad. After living in three different countries—Britain, Canada and the United States—I am convinced that some governments are much worse than others. As far as personal freedom is concerned Canada for example has a lot more to recommend it than does the United States. In fact from a purely personal point of view—attitude towards public health, education system, etc.—local government in the southern state where I live at the moment is positively alarming. Now from the long range viewpoint it may be immaterial whether we have moderately bad politicians or downright evil politi-

are occasions when one kind of government is preferable to another. I adhere to certain ideas not because they are correct or even logical but because they are the only ones possible in hopeless circumstances.

Consider for example the question of capital punishment. I don't believe that the death penalty for murder is always wrong. In Britain and Scandinavia the death penalty may well have little effect on the murder rate but in other parts of the world this may not always be true. The city where I live is in permanent competition with another southern American city for the title: "The Murder Capital of the World", i.e. as to which city has the greatest number of murders per year per 100,000 of the population. Incidentally many deaths which would be called murder elsewhere are not so regarded here, e.g. shooting any man who is in bed with your wife. This is classed as shooting in self-defence since clearly the other fellow was attacking your wife with a dangerous weapon! Actually the death penalty is in force in this state but is seldom applied, certain sections of the law being very poorly enforced. I honestly cannot see any way of improving this state of affairs, given the present set-up, without an authoritarian solution. Again the fact that the tensions and pressures of living here would not exist under anarchism is largely irrelevant. The question still keeps arising:— what should be done here and now?

I am sure other people must have similar questions in mind when faced with the ideas of anarchism. In conclusion I hope you will accept the fact that these questions have not been put forward in a spirit of carping criticism, but rather for the purpose of finding out.

Sincerely and fraternally,

B.T.

Texas, June

ed on with the greatest disgust, must be numbered the chief of all pregnant words ever printed in FREEDOM. Incidentally, though W.M. destroys his own bogey, authoritarianism, by exposing it as an effect and not the cause it is so erroneously held to be. Only when the cause of authoritarianism is seen for what it is will there be possibility of its extermination.

Yours fraternally,

22nd June.

DAVID MACCONNELL.

the point that K... he said, that wh... Britain and her o... ian, as in the ca... lost Ireland. How... were loose, as in t... two countries had... and partners.

This then is the... but even more im... is the argument th... during rehearsals

Render Unto Caesar

Labour or Communist Parties, and the recent statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury on H-Bomb tests was as honest as could be expected.

'Obey Caesar and God'

Dr. Fisher, in an interview on television, said:—

'I think nothing would be lost by suspending nuclear tests for a time. Someone must take the first step.

Nuclear weapons and tests are terrible. I only wish we had taken the lead in this matter and I would like to see us take it now while there is a possibility of us doing so in a way which will not jeopardise the Government's responsibility to protect our security.

All war is detestable, horrible and sinful in the sight of God.

But in a sinful world good people have to do sinful things sometimes. You have to obey Caesar and God and the task of humanity is to reconcile the two.

Very often in a sinful world you have to support Caesar even though it is far less than the complete will of God.'

Less honest, in our opinion, were his answers in another TV interview to questions about Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus, whose invitation from Dr. Fisher to the Lambeth Conference created a disturbance among those who think that terrorism should be the monopoly of properly constituted governments only.

Readers may remember that Makarios was asked to attend the Lambeth Conference because he is after all the accredited head of the Christian Church in a British colony. And originally the attitude of Dr. Fisher was that the question was a purely religious one and 'politics' did not come into it.

In fact, last week on TV Dr. Fisher said:

'his (Makarios) personal character, quite apart from his politics, is no concern of mine.

When I ask official people who are heads of churches I can't examine their characters any more than if the Prime Minister wants to invite the Prime Minister of Russia he has to examine his character.'

Sup, Nevertheless

Now this seems... tively honest at... sup with the de... spoon, but you... But then Dr. Fis...

'I know as well... character he is.

I regard with a... political behaviour... with terrorism.'... he was being fa...

For Makarios'

Enosis movement... EOKA in part... nothing more... unto Caesar tha... It is, however,... and therein lies... Fisher's moralis...

But he has no... to judge Makari... —if any—with... is the H-Bomb... ror-weapon of t... Fisher is prepar... the British Caes... this terror over... peoples of the w... sinners are doin... have no moral... Archbishop Ma... supporting a m... terror on behal... supports.

In the Background

However, to... said that unlike... bishop of Cante... to infallibility.

All he says is

'What surprises... treats what I say

What I say is... of a reasonably... has a Christian ba... that are going on.'

But Dr. Fisher... fact the 'Christia... nition is a bit ri... the head of the... in one of the 'g... world. In fact... 'background' is... that is where Dr... forerunners an... have pushed th... But Caesar is w...

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

E. A. GUTKIND:

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

VOLUME:

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) The Unknown Revolution cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS:

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

JOHN HEWETSON:

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:

Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

ERRICO MALATESTA:

Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

HERBERT READ:

Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

TONY GIBSON:

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.



Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

The Golden Age

COMRADES,

It is an engrossing circumstance—for me, at least—that your issue 21/6/58 has on the same page of it letters from W.M. Skegness and Arthur W. Uloth. Mr. Uloth I always look upon as the “Golden Age” man, and I am going to remember W.M. by this first letter of his to FREEDOM because of its unconscious contradiction of Mr. Uloth.

“Golden Age” must be a purely subjective term, depending so wholly as it does upon what is personally meant by “golden”. In Mr. Uloth’s sense of the word it means anarchism; a time when each man was in himself all-sufficient, wholly independent, acquiring all he felt in need of by work of his own head and hands. In the days of such men there were few people on earth, and there was no “golden age”, because there was no gold as men have since become to know gold. There was no money, and the “golden age”, which is the age we live in now, began when pressure of population created problems which compelled men to invent a medium of exchange as a substitute for cumbersome barter.

W.M.’s “Quite clearly one and all are so pleasantly occupied pursuing money and making money and enjoying the comforts money can bring that any agitation, left or right of centre, is frowned on with the greatest disgust,” must be numbered the chief of all pregnant words ever printed in FREEDOM. Incidentally, though W.M. destroys his own bogey, authoritarianism, by exposing it as an effect and not the cause it is so erroneously held to be. Only when the cause of authoritarianism is seen for what it is will there be possibility of its extermination.

Yours fraternally,

22nd June.

DAVID MACCONNELL.

Questions for Anarchists

DEAR COMRADES,

On Sunday the 15th June I had the rare honour, for an anarchist that is, of appearing on a T.V. Programme designed for young people. The show was the “Sunday Break” put on by A.B.C. Television from Birmingham.

A few weeks before a rather garbled definition of Anarchism had been given on the programme and I wrote in criticising it. Not with the desire of seeking distinction for myself but because I felt that the ideals that men had defended in Portugal, Spain and Bulgaria should have a fair hearing. I am glad to say that I was allowed to put the case for Anarchism and this, below is the outline of my argument.

1. Anarchists are serious people.
2. We do not advocate bomb throwing for violence’s sake.
3. We believe that there is too much Government in the world. (I had to say too much Government because people find it difficult to understand the principle of organisation without Government.)

4. Anarchists believe that every individual has the right to refuse to obey the opinions of the majority so long as that refusal does no harm to the group.

5. Anarchists believe that society should be based on free association with Communes federated one with another. I pointed to the British Empire and made the point that Kropotkin had made when he said, that where the ties between Britain and her colony were authoritarian, as in the case of Ireland—Britain lost Ireland. However, where the bonds were loose, as in the case of Canada, the two countries had remained firm friends and partners.

This then is the gist of what I said, but even more important to my mind, is the argument that ranged around me during rehearsals before the show. It

proved to me that the youth of the country are not so lethargic as their elders and though many of them do not know what Anarchism is, when presented with it **THEY ARE NOT DISINTERESTED**. Here are some of the criticisms that I had to face:—

1. Why use the word Anarchism when you really stand for pure communism?
2. Wouldn’t life be dull in a Free Society where there was nothing to spur us on?
3. Anarchism is too Utopian!
4. Some people are born leaders. What would they do in a Free Society?
5. How would you make sure that everyone pulled their weight?
6. Aren’t some Anarchists, particularly Spanish Anarchists, rather cruel?

I have listed these questions here because I believe that we must go out and tackle the youth of the country and if we do it is just as well that we know what questions they might ask. Furthermore, I believe that they are questions that should be discussed in FREEDOM so that we can turn on our young critics and show them that they are wrong.

London, June 22.

M. KEITH.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB.
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

July 6.—Arthur W. Uloth on
MAN AGAINST SOCIETY

JULY 13.—Donovan Pedely on
ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL August 2nd—4th.

Subject: “WAR AND PEACE”
Speakers to be announced

Bookings are requested as soon as possible. Write: JOAN SCULTHORPE, c/o Freedom Press.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Render Unto Caesar

Continued
from p. 1

Labour or Communist Parties, and the recent statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury on H-Bomb tests was as honest as could be expected.

‘Obey Caesar and God’

Dr. Fisher, in an interview on television, said:—

‘I think nothing would be lost by suspending nuclear tests for a time. Someone must take the first step.

Nuclear weapons and tests are terrible. I only wish we had taken the lead in this matter and I would like to see us take it now while there is a possibility of us doing so in a way which will not jeopardise the Government’s responsibility to protect our security.

All war is detestable, horrible and sinful in the sight of God.

Sup, Nevertheless

Now this seems to us to be a relatively honest attitude. When you sup with the devil you use a long spoon, but you sup nevertheless. But then Dr. Fisher went on to say:

‘I know as well as anybody what a bad character he is.

I regard with abhorrence his general political behaviour and his association with terrorism.’

he was being far from honest.

For Makarios’ association with the Enosis movement in Cyprus or with EOKA in particular is after all nothing more than *his* rendering unto Caesar that which is Caesar’s. It is, however, a different Caesar, and therein lies the cause of Dr. Fisher’s moralising.

But he has no grounds on which

...because I believe in
one kind of govern-
to another. I adhere
not because they are
tical but because they
possible in hopeless

...the question of
I don't believe that
for murder is always
and Scandinavia the
well have little effect
but in other parts of
y not always be true.
live is in permanent
another southern
the title: "The Mur-
the World", i.e. as to
the greatest number of
per 100,000 of the
entally many deaths
alled murder elsewhere
ed here, e.g. shooting
in bed with your wife.
shooting in self-defence
ther fellow was attack-
a dangerous weapon!
h penalty is in force
is seldom applied, cer-
law being very poorly
tly cannot see any
g this state of affairs,
t set-up, without an
ation. Again the fact
and pressures of living
exist under anarchism
nt. The question still
what should be done

...er people must have
in mind when faced
anarchism. In conclu-
will accept the fact
ns have not been put
it of carping criticism,
purpose of finding out.
and fraternally,
B.T.

...ER :
d Culture cloth 21s.
BERNERI :
r West
s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.
TESTA :
6d.
1d.
olution of Man 4s.
Marxism and
3s. 6d.
archism
oth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
of Anarchism
boards 2s. 6d.
of Free Men 1s.
om, paper 2s.
he Dirty Work? 2d.

ER :
d Culture cloth 21s.

BERNERI :
r West
s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

TESTA :
6d.
1d.

olution of Man 4s.
Marxism and
3s. 6d.

archism
oth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
of Anarchism
boards 2s. 6d.
of Free Men 1s.

om, paper 2s.
he Dirty Work? 2d.

meri Memorial
ations :
berneri, 1918-1949:
cloth 5s.
gh Utopia
loth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

n Street,
C.I.

agitation, left on the
ed on with the greatest disgust," must
be numbered the chief of all pregnant
words ever printed in FREEDOM. Inci-
dentally, though W.M. destroys his own
bogey, authoritarianism, by exposing it
as an effect and not the cause it is so
erroneously held to be. Only when the
cause of authoritarianism is seen for
what it is will there be possibility of its
extermination.

Yours fraternally,
22nd June. DAVID MACCONNELL.

Render Unto Caesar

Continued
from p. 1

Labour or Communist Parties, and
the recent statement by the Arch-
bishop of Canterbury on H-Bomb
tests was as honest as could be ex-
pected.

'Obey Caesar and God'

Dr. Fisher, in an interview on
television, said:—

'I think nothing would be lost by sus-
pending nuclear tests for a time. Some-
one must take the first step.

Nuclear weapons and tests are terrible.
I only wish we had taken the lead in this
matter and I would like to see us take
it now while there is a possibility of us
doing so in a way which will not jeopard-
ise the Government's responsibility to
protect our security.

All war is detestable, horrible and sin-
ful in the sight of God.

But in a sinful world good people have
to do sinful things sometimes. You have
to obey Caesar and God and the task
of humanity is to reconcile the two.

Very often in a sinful world you have
to support Caesar even though it is far
less than the complete will of God.'

Less honest, in our opinion, were
his answers in another TV interview
to questions about Archbishop
Makarios of Cyprus, whose invita-
tion from Dr. Fisher to the Lambeth
Conference created a disturbance
among those who think that terror-
ism should be the monopoly of
properly constituted governments
only.

Readers may remember that Mak-
arios was asked to attend the Lam-
beth Conference because he is after
all the accredited head of the Chris-
tian Church in a British colony.
And originally the attitude of Dr.
Fisher was that the question was a
purely religious one and 'politics'
did not come into it.

In fact, last week on TV Dr.
Fisher said:

'his (Makarios') personal character,
quite apart from his politics, is no con-
cern of mine.

When I ask official people who are
heads of churches I can't examine their
characters any more than if the Prime
Minister wants to invite the Prime Min-
ister of Russia he has to examine his
character.'

I pointed to the British Empire and made
the point that Kropotkin had made when
he said, that where the ties between
Britain and her colony were authoritar-
ian, as in the case of Ireland—Britain
lost Ireland. However, where the bonds
were loose, as in the case of Canada, the
two countries had remained firm friends
and partners.

This then is the gist of what I said,
but even more important to my mind,
is the argument that ranged around me
during rehearsals before the show. It

Sup, Nevertheless

Now this seems to us to be a rela-
tively honest attitude. When you
sup with the devil you use a long
spoon, but you sup nevertheless.
But then Dr. Fisher went on to say:

'I know as well as anybody what a bad
character he is.

I regard with abhorrence his general
political behaviour and his association
with terrorism.'

he was being far from honest.

For Makarios' association with the
Enosis movement in Cyprus or with
EOKA in particular is after all
nothing more than *his* rendering
unto Caesar that which is Caesar's.
It is, however, a different Caesar,
and therein lies the cause of Dr.
Fisher's moralising.

But he has no grounds on which
to judge Makarios for his association
—if any—with terrorism. For what
is the H-Bomb but the supreme ter-
ror-weapon of them all. And if Dr.
Fisher is prepared to render up to
the British Caesar the right to hold
this terror over the heads of the
peoples of the world (because other
sinners are doing the same) he can
have no moral arguments against
Archbishop Makarios condoning or
supporting a much more limited
terror on behalf of the Caesar *he*
supports.

In the Background

However, to his credit let it be
said that unlike the Pope, the Arch-
bishop of Canterbury lays no claim
to infallibility.

All he says is:

'What surprises me is that anyone
treats what I say controversially.

What I say is really the contribution
of a reasonably intelligent person who
has a Christian background, about things
that are going on.'

But Dr. Fisher is too modest. In
fact the 'Christian background' defi-
nition is a bit rich. After all, he is
the head of the established Church
in one of the 'great' nations of the
world. In fact, though, perhaps
'background' is the right word. For
that is where Dr. Fisher and all his
forerunners and contemporaries
have pushed the ethics of Christ.
But Caesar is well to the fore.

...cause I believe in

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB.

32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

July 6.—Arthur W. Uloth on
MAN AGAINST SOCIETY

JULY 13.—Donovan Pedelty on
ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL

August 2nd—4th.

Subject: "WAR AND PEACE"
Speakers to be announced

Bookings are requested as soon as
possible. Write: JOAN SCULTHORPE, c/o
Freedom Press.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.

MALATESTA CLUB

32 Percy Street

Tottenham Court Road W1

Jazz Men welcome
Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should
be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed
a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364